

U.S.S.N. 10/798,590

Remarks

Claims 1, 13, 17, 31 and 34 have been amended. Claims 23-30 have been withdrawn. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in general throughout Applicants' Specification and in particular, for example, at page 6, line 3.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 13 renders moot the objection thereto and request that it be withdrawn.

Applicants further submit that the amendments to claims 17 and 34 render moot the objection to claims 17, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further in regard to claim 17, an insulating glass unit is a type of insulating glass assembly. An insulating sash assembly is another type of insulating glass assembly.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 11, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hornung et al. (U.S. 2004/0074588).

Prior to October 21, 2002, the filing date of the Hornung et al. publication, Applicants developed a cold press sealant composition and had a manufacturer prepare an insulating glass unit by applying the cold press sealant composition to a surface of a spacer, contacting the sealant composition with glass panes, and applying pressure on the assembly at room temperature to bond the glass panes to the spacer through the sealant composition (see, Declaration of Bing Wang, which is attached hereto as Exhibit A). Applicants submit, therefore, that Hornung et al. is not available as a prior art reference against the above-captioned application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hornung et al. has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claims 3, 6, 10-11, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hornung et al. has been overcome and Applicants request that it be withdrawn.

The remaining rejections, i.e., claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Hornung et al. in view of the Admitted Prior Art, Claim 5 over Hornung et al. and further in view of Briese et al. (U.S. 2002/0069823), claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Hornung et al. in view of Hornung (U.S. 6679013), claims 18, 20-22 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Hornung et al., claims 7-9, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. over Hornung et al. in view of Wey et al. (U.S. 5,994,474), and claims 34-35 under 35

U.S.S.N. 10/798,590

U.S.C. § 103 over Hornung in view of the Admitted Prior Art, are based on the premise that Hornung et al. is a valid prior art reference. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicants submit that the remaining rejections have been rendered moot and request that they be withdrawn.

There being no further rejections of record, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests action in accordance therewith. Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned should a teleconference interview facilitate prosecution of the application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment made to Deposit Account No. 06-2241.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2006



Bin Su

Reg. No. 51,309

Patent Department
H.B. Fuller Company
1200 Willow Lake Blvd.
P.O. Box 64683
St. Paul, MN 55164-0683